



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,060	12/21/2001	Kimberly Ann Newell	M233.101.101	2940
25281	7590	12/21/2004	EXAMINER	
DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, P.L.L.C. FIFTH STREET TOWERS 100 SOUTH FIFTH STREET, SUITE 2250 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			LUU, SY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/028,060	NEWELL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sy D Luu	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-83 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-83 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/3/02 & 11/6/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States District Court Northern District of California ("CA District Court", Electronic Case Filing Users Manual).

As per claim 1, CA District Court teaches a computer-based user interface for accessing litigation information associated with at least one litigation case, the user interface comprising:

a web page including a first plurality of user-selectable hyperlinks, each hyperlink in the first plurality of hyperlinks identifying a category of litigation information (page 14, *figure depicting CA District Court "Civil Events" web page*); and

a plurality of web pages, each web page associated with one of the hyperlinks in the first plurality of hyperlinks, each web page providing litigation information related to the category identified by the hyperlink associated with the web page, each web page displayed in response to selection of the hyperlink associated with the web page (pages 13-14; *web pages associated with their respective hyperlinks, e.g. the figure on page 15 depicting "Motions"*).

CA District Court does not specifically teach the "Civil Events" web page to be the homepage. However, designation of a web page as a homepage is a design and implementation choice/preference, and thus would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to present the menu choices as well as hyperlinks as shown in order to simplify the menu navigation with the most common information.

As per claims 2-34, 36 and 43, CA District Court teaches categories to be various types of information such as contact information (*figures on pages 15-16*), docket information (*figure on page 28 regarding Docket Sheet*), correspondence information (*"Responses and Replies" option as depicted in figure on page 14, and also on page 23*), pleadings information (*information would be shown after selection of any of the hyperlinks under the heading of "Initial Pleadings and Service" in the figure on page 14*), discovery information (*"Discovery Documents" option as depicted in figure on page 14*), trial information (*"Trial Documents" option as depicted in figure on page 14*), motion information (*"Motions" option as depicted in figure on page 14*), search feature (*"Query" option as depicted in on the toolbar of the figure on page 14*), hyperlinks to electronic copies (*pages 17, 25, 28-29 shows how filed copies of litigation information saved as PDF format could be accessed by selecting their respective hyperlinks*). CA District Court does not expressly disclose rules, patent, expert, court orders,

Art Unit: 2174

copy, client and status information, as well as detail description of all the information. However, these types of information and details are well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine/include these information/features with the teaching of CA District Court in order to provide all pertinent information as required in a litigation management system.

As per claims 35, 38-42, 44-48, all claim limitations such as various configuration of client/server computers and data storage methods on a networks, presenting to users all main menu options/hyperlinks at all times, and launching application programs from a web page using hyperlinks are well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine/include these features with the teaching of CA District Court in order to facilitate users navigation of web pages, as well as to manage, share and distribute litigation information efficiently and effectively.

Claim 49 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 17 and 40, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 50-51 are similar in scope to the combination of claims 7, 14, 21, 27, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 52-53 are similar in scope to the combination of claims 2-3, 5, 7, 10, 14, 18, 21, 24, 27-28, and 11 are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 54-58 are similar in scope to claims 33-36 and 38 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 59-61 are similar in scope to claims 46-48 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 62 is similar in scope to claim 49, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 63-66 are similar in scope to claims 52, 56-58, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 68-69 are similar in scope to claims 42 and 44, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale. Although CA District Court does not expressly indicate data storage to be on the client computer, however, the choice of storing data information in either the server or client in a network environment is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to select either storage destination as a preference depending on the implementation method.

Claims 70-74 are similar in scope to claims 62, 65, 50-52, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 75 is similar in scope to claims 49, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale. CA District Court further discloses a client login page (page 11, *top figure*).

As per claim 76, CA District Court discloses the user interface information further comprises: a plurality of topics pages, each topics page associated with a particular client and including a plurality of hyperlinks identifying a plurality of topics, the plurality of hyperlinks identifying a plurality of topics including a litigation hyperlink; and wherein each litigation case selection page is associated with a litigation hyperlink on one of the plurality of topics pages (pages 11-14).

As per claims 77-79, all claim limitations regarding the use of inactive hyperlinks, links to client's competitors as well as client's intellectual property applications are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include these features

Art Unit: 2174

with the teaching of CA District Court in order to facilitate users navigation of web pages, as well as to provide users with means to quickly access pertinent and critical litigation information.

Claim 81 is similar in scope to claims 50 and 52, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 82-83 are similar in scope to claim 65, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Inquires

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sy Luu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 7:00 am to 4:30 pm (EST). The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (571) 272-4063.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



SY D. LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER